

Application No.: 09/580,272
Amendment Dated: February 16, 2006
Reply to Office Action of: October 4, 2005

REMARKS

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 9 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks urged here, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,247,048 to Greer et al. ("Greer") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,670 to Bennett et al. (Bennett) and U.S. Patent No. 6,244,758 to Solymar et al. ("Solymar").

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9 and 19 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the method creates a "two-way communication link" between the peripheral computer system and the host computer system. Additionally, claim 1 recites that the host computer system recognizes the transport mechanism by use of an "adaptation means." Additionally, claim 9 has been amended to recite a "two-way communication link" between the host computer system and the peripheral computer system. Claim 9 also has been amended to recite that the host computer system is operable through "an adaptation means" to recognize the transport mechanism of a plurality of transport mechanisms. Claim 19 has been amended to recite a "two-way" communication link between the host computer system and the peripheral computer system.

The present invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 9 and 19, is directed to a method and system for determining the most efficient transport protocol for transferring information between a host computer system and a peripheral computer system by creating a two-way communication link between the two computer systems. In one embodiment, as recited in claim 1, the method comprises creating a two-way communication link from the peripheral computer system to a host computer system by using one of the transport mechanisms out of a plurality of transport mechanisms. Such recognized transport mechanism is used by an adaptation means to determine a communication protocol from an

Application No.: 09/580,272
Amendment Dated: February 16, 2006
Reply to Office Action of: October 4, 2005

indexing table to determine a parameter in the communication protocol. Similarly, claim 9 is directed to a system for communication between a peripheral computer system and a host computer system which includes a two-way communication link established on one transport mechanism. Importantly, the host computer system operates through an adaptation means to recognize the transport mechanism which forms the basis for the communication protocol between the computer systems. In another embodiment, as recited in claim 19, the invention is a method for an apparatus for transferring information on a host computer system and a personal digital assistant including a two-way communication link being made on one transport mechanism out of a plurality of transport mechanisms where the architecture on the host computer system includes adaptation software operable to determine a communication protocol.

By contrast, Examiner's base reference, Greer, is directed to transcoding of character sets between client and server computer systems. Greer teaches that such transcoding is performed through transport mechanisms which are independent of the communication protocol involved. As recited in, for example, step (c) of claim 1, the present invention clearly requires the protocol to be based on the transport mechanism. Additionally, Greer does not teach or suggest an adaptation means for recognizing the transport mechanism.

The shortcomings of the base reference are not overcome by Bennett or Solymar. Bennett is directed to data transfer over client server systems in a TCP/IP protocol suite. While Bennett does contemplate different transport mechanisms for the data transfer, Bennett is directed to a singular protocol, TCP/IP, and therefore does not teach or suggest selection of one protocol from a plurality of protocols. Solymar is directed to a host computer periodically calling a client computer system for security purposes. Solymar does not teach or suggest two-way communication between the host and a peripheral computer system as is required by the present invention.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that a combination of Greer, Bennett and Solymar does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488

Application No.: 09/580,272
Amendment Dated: February 16, 2006
Reply to Office Action of: October 4, 2005

(Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claims 1, 9 and 19 are allowable over the cited references. Claims 2-8, 10-18 and 20-21, by their dependency on claims 1, 9 and 19 respectively, are similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.



Dated: February 16, 2006

By: _____
Bosco Kim
Registration No. 41,896

Berry & Associates P.C.
9255 Sunset Boulevard
Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860